

## RAVENNA CREEK DAYLIGHTING PROJECT PUBLIC MEETING

**DATE:** September 5, 2002  
**RECORDER:** Becki Kniveton  
**REPRESENTED:** City of Seattle, Creek Alliance, People for Playfields, People Surrounding Upperfield, People East of Park, People Near Cowen Park

### Comments:

- Because there is not a big sign along street, a true representation of neighborhood is not present
- Heard that there is landfill under the park – would open water through this bring up toxic materials?
- Which trees are lost on Alternative #1? Could you raise ballfield, as in Alternative #2?
- What will soccer field be like in Alternative #3? (what characteristics?)
- Ballfield grading – extent of grading needed to put field in upper area
- Did the play area ever come into consideration in the alternatives?
- How high do fences have to be along fenceline if playfield moved to upper field?
- Meadowbrook great. Area is filling up. Why can't we have both nature spaces and fields in Cowen Park
- Cowen Park isn't large and isn't flat and isn't dry
- Phillip fears the area will be degraded with beer bottles; slope should be used for seating; concerned with amount of fill and stream width
- Asked Peggy to stop advertising Alternative #3+4. Proposes community make a decision. Proposes remove Alternative #3+4 from consideration.
- Can not vote – violation of the U.S. Constitution
- Proposes immediate neighborhood support of Alt. 2. How much creek is enough creek – thinks Alt. 2 supports all three interest groups.
- Supports Alt. 2. Doesn't want creek to go to 55<sup>th</sup>.
- Proposes Alt. 3 & 4. Says lose the field.
- Told her that she's bringing this in at the last meeting and is unfair
- Keep upper level as spontaneous (not organized)
- Prefers Alt. 3, but would defer to families that live immediately in the area. Would like space for young children to play
- Clarification needed on meadow area – lawn or wildflowers?
- Proposes not removing upper playfield
- Feels it is unsafe for children to play in upper playfield. How much it costs to re-do the playfield – use this money on the stream and move the ballfield to Cowen Park
- Move soccer field to north of wading pool and ballfield to upper field
- Unsafe to play near ballfield
- Most people want upper field to remain as is
- Proposes that park should be more small child friendly. Climbing tree, swings area – parent can watch multiple children
- Small children won't use water area. Supports Alt. 2. Thinks there is a bias from presenters.

- In favor of Alt. 2. Money from Alt. 3 & 4 should be used to improve play area.
- Small child friendly and safe are the priorities
- On Alt. 1, could you do some grading so elevation between upper and lower is not so great
- Doesn't care where fields are, but we need to keep field. Outfield is not good for soccer.
- Prefers Alt. 3 & 4. Proposes ballfield go to upper field and programmed better to be for parents to bring kids when games aren't scheduled
- Proposes we look more closely at Alt. 2, and leave 1, 3 & 4 out of discussion for 10 minutes
- Wants playfield turned on Alt. 2 to make creek curvier for fish habitat
- Urban villages planned to SE – more people – upper field needs to be left as non-scheduled
- Move \_\_\_\_\_ north for more soccer area on Alt. 3
- Not just for small kids – older kids use soccer & ballfield. Likes Alt. 3 most
- UW student: prefers upper playfield because it is not scheduled use. Placing playfield in upper area destroys this area
- Concerned with mature trees being removed along 55<sup>th</sup>
- Move playfield to north of wading pool
- Ballfield needs to be moved for the creek to be a creek. Proposed right side only of Alt. 3 & 4 and ask Parks to find another place for ballfield
- Magneson Park used as playfield
- Feeling that too much importance is placed on baseball and soccer use
- Who uses this park now and who will this renovation invite and who do we want to invite?
- Families in the immediate area important – seem to prefer Alt. 2
- Large variety of uses, lots of deterioration of park – can we maintain the daylighted creek? – if not, we have reduced playing space and not created habitat
- Alt. 2 is daylighting an open swathe. Not doing enough for creek. Leaning more towards Alt. 3 & 4
- People are taking their enthusiasm for daylighting a slough and cramming it into playfield area. You can't improve creek now. Proposes no new construction. Use money to improve existing creek and repair existing park
- This whole procedure has been to daylight creek. A large group of people want the creek daylighted.
- As a student and parent, loves Alt. 4, thinks all are improvements. Kids love water and the creek.
- To take away upper playfield will degrade quality of life for residences nearby.
- Need to do greatest good for greatest number. We would be better off if playfield not there at all.
- Future is unknown – can't assure new playfields will be created elsewhere
- Primary thing we need in increased density area is nature. This is the only place we can daylight stream and nature area
- Who defines nature?

- Should be noted – people want to accommodate creek, accommodate ballfield, and keep it out of upper playfield
- Lots of sports injuries, move path to other side of creek to reduce injuries. Kids climbing in trees would be hurt if ballfield in upper playfield
- Incredible opportunity for access to creek from street. An identity community has already formed around creek
- Leave 55<sup>th</sup> street \_\_\_\_\_ as noise and view buffer
- Lake was much higher historically and Ravenna Creek ended up here not at lake. No endangered fish – can't move ballfield out of this area and into upper playfield

Virginia: will bring recommendations to Park Board meeting next Thursday, September 12, 2002, 7:00 p.m., 100 Dexter Avenue North, Seattle